arXiv:1704.04215v1 [cs.LO] 13 Apr 2017

Parameterized Local Lexing

Steven Obua
Recursive Mind (www.recursivemind.com)
steven@recursivemind.com

Abstract

Building on the concept of *local lexing* the concept of *parameterized local lexing* is introduced.

1. Motivation

We previously introduced *local lexing* as a new semantics for integrated lexing and parsing, and provided an algorithm (based on Earley's Algorithm) for it [1]. This algorithm can handle arbitrary context-free grammars. In principle it can even deal with infinite grammars, but to harness this capability in practice we need a finite representation of such possibly infinite grammars. *Parameterized local lexing* delivers such a finite representation, and comes with an algorithm tuned to that representation. Of course the finite representation as presented in this paper is not the only possible one, but it is simple and intuitive and yet powerful.

2. Definition

We call a tuple

$$(\Phi, \mathfrak{N}, \mathfrak{T}, \mathfrak{R}, \mathfrak{S}, \phi_{\mathit{start}}, \Sigma, \mathit{Lex}, \mathit{Sel})$$

a parameterized local lexing iff:

- Φ is a non-empty set of parameters.
- $\mathfrak{N}$ and $\mathfrak{T}$ are disjoint sets of nonterminals and terminals.
- $\mathfrak{S} \in \mathfrak{N}$ and $\phi_{\mathit{start}} \in \Phi$ are the start symbol and start parameter, respectively.
- $\mathfrak{R}$ is a set of parameterized rules. Each rule has the form

  $$N_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_k^{f_k}$$

  where $N, X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathfrak{N}$, and $f_1, \dots, f_k, f_{k+1}$ are partial functions with the signatures $f_i : \Phi^{2i-1} \nrightarrow \Phi$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$.
- Σ is a set of characters.
- *Lex* is a function which for each (t, α, D, k) such that $t \in \mathfrak{T}$, $\alpha \in \Phi$, $D \in \Sigma^*$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, |D|\}$ returns a set consisting of tuples (t, α, β, c) such that $\beta \in \Phi$, $c \in \Sigma^*$, $k + |c| \leq |D|$ and $c_i = D_{k+i}$ for all i such that $0 \leq i \leq |c| - 1$.
- *Sel* takes two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathfrak{T} \times \Phi \times \Phi \times \Sigma^*$ such that $A \subseteq B$ and returns a set $\mathit{Sel}(A, B)$ such that $A \subseteq \mathit{Sel}(A, B) \subseteq B$.

3. Semantics

The semantics of parameterized local lexing is provided by translating it to ordinary local lexing. The result is a context-free grammar $(\overline{\mathfrak{N}}, \overline{\mathfrak{T}}, \overline{\mathfrak{R}}, \top)$ together with a lexer $\overline{\mathit{Lex}}$ and selector $\overline{\mathit{Sel}}$ operating on the same character set Σ as the parameterized local lexing. The resulting nonterminals and terminals of the new grammar are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathfrak{N}} &= (\mathfrak{N} \times \Phi \times \Phi) \cup \{\top, \bot\} \\ \overline{\mathfrak{T}} &= \mathfrak{T} \times \Phi \times \Phi \end{aligned}$$

For elements $(N, \alpha, \beta) \in \overline{\mathfrak{N}}$ and $(t, \alpha, \beta) \in \overline{\mathfrak{T}}$ we also write N_β^α and t_β^α, respectively. Here α is called the *input parameter*, and β is called the *output parameter*. The nonterminal $\bot$ represents failure and therefore does not appear on the left hand side of any rule in $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}$. The nonterminal $\top$ is the start symbol of the new grammar and appears only on the left hand side of the rules in the following subset of $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}$:

$$\left\{ \top \to \mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{\mathit{start}}} \mid \beta \in \Phi \right\}$$

Given $u \geq 1$ partial functions $f_1, \dots, f_u$ with signatures $f_i : \Phi^{2i-1} \nrightarrow \Phi$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, u\}$, we define the set $\langle f_1, \dots, f_u \rangle$ to consist of all sequences $\rho \in \Phi^{2u}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & f_1 \text{ is defined at } \rho_0 \\ \wedge\ & \rho_1 = f_1(\rho_0) \\ \wedge\ & f_2 \text{ is defined at } (\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2) \\ \wedge\ & \rho_3 = f_2(\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2) \\ \wedge\ & f_3 \text{ is defined at } (\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4) \\ \wedge\ & \rho_5 = f_3(\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4) \\ & \vdots \\ \wedge\ & f_u \text{ is defined at } (\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_{2u-2}) \\ \wedge\ & \rho_{2u-1} = f_u(\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_{2u-2}) \end{aligned}$$

With each parameterized rule $r = N_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_k^{f_k}$ we associate its induced set of rules $\overline{r} \subseteq \overline{\mathfrak{R}}$. Firstly, $\overline{r}$ contains all rules

$$N_\beta^\alpha \to X_{1\,\beta_1}^{\ \alpha_1} \dots X_{k\,\beta_k}^{\ \alpha_k}$$

such that $\alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_k\,\beta_k\,\beta \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{k+1}\rangle$.

Secondly, we also need to somehow take into account those cases where some f_i happens to be undefined on its arguments. While these cases do not affect the language $\mathcal{L}$ of the induced context-free grammar, they possibly do affect its prefix language $\mathcal{L}_{\text{prefix}}$. We choose to let $\overline{r}$ contain also all rules

$$N_\beta^\alpha \to X_1{}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_h{}_{\beta_h}^{\alpha_h}\ \bot$$

such that

$$\begin{array}{l} h \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \wedge \beta \in \Phi \wedge \beta_h \in \Phi \\ \wedge\, \alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_h \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_h\rangle \\ \wedge\, f_{h+1} \text{ is undefined at } (\alpha, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_h, \beta_h) \end{array}$$

The induced set of rules $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}$ is thus defined as

$$\overline{\mathfrak{R}} = \left\{ \top \to \mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \mid \beta \in \Phi \right\} \cup \bigcup_{r \in \mathfrak{R}} \overline{r}$$

Defining the induced lexer is straightforward:

$$\overline{Lex}(t_\beta^\alpha)(D, k) = \left\{ (t_\beta^\alpha, c) \mid (t, \alpha, \beta, c) \in Lex(t, \alpha, D, k) \right\}$$

There is an obvious bijection $\mathcal{U} : \mathfrak{T} \times \Phi \times \Phi \times \Sigma^* \to \overline{\mathfrak{T}} \times \Sigma^*$ between parameterized tokens and ordinary tokens, given by $\mathcal{U}(t, \alpha, \beta, c) = (t_\beta^\alpha, c)$. Lifted to a bijection between token sets, we use it to define the induced selector:

$$\overline{Sel}(A, B) = \mathcal{U}(Sel(\mathcal{U}^{-1}(A), \mathcal{U}^{-1}(B)))$$

A character sequence $D \in \Sigma^*$ is said to be in the character language of the parameterized local lexing iff $\ell\ell(D) \neq \emptyset$ with respect to the induced local lexing. Furthermore, we can associate with each $D \in \Sigma^*$ the set of its outputs $\sigma(D) \subseteq \Phi$ via

$$\sigma(D) = \left\{ \beta \mid \exists\, p.\ p \in \ell\ell(D) \text{ and } \top \Rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \overset{*}{\Rightarrow} [p] \right\}.$$

Obviously, $\ell\ell(D) = \emptyset$ iff $\sigma(D) = \emptyset$.

4. Algorithm

Given Φ, $\mathfrak{N}$, $\mathfrak{T}$ and $\mathfrak{R}$ are all finite, parameterized local lexing can be implemented simply by reducing it via its semantics to ordinary local lexing, and then applying the Earley-based local lexing algorithm (ELLA). This is rather awkward though as the induced grammar is potentially much larger than the original grammar. In particular, $|\overline{\mathfrak{R}}|$ might be much larger than $|\mathfrak{R}|$. Furthermore, we would also like to have the option of doing parameterized local lexing for an infinite set of parameters Φ like the set of natural numbers, but usually this would lead to an infinite set of rules $\overline{\mathfrak{R}}$.

Luckily it is straightforward to derive from ELLA an algorithm for parameterized local lexing (PELLA) which avoids such a translation to ordinary local lexing but works directly on *parameterized items*. A parameterized item is a tuple (r, d, i, j, ρ), such that $r = N_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k} \in \mathfrak{R}$, $0 \leq d \leq k$ and $0 \leq i \leq j \leq |D|$, where $D \in \Sigma^*$ is the input under consideration. The sequence $\rho \in \Phi^{2(d+1)}$ records the choices of parameters that have been made so far, and therefore we demand that the invariant $\rho \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{d+1}\rangle$ holds for each parameterized item.

Before describing how PELLA operates on parameterized items, let us establish a correspondence between parameterized items and the items of the induced ordinary local lexing. Just how each parameterized rule corresponds to a set of ordinary rules, each parameterized item x corresponds to a set of ELLA items $\overline{x}$. Firstly, for each rule $q = N_\beta^\alpha \to X_1{}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_k{}_{\beta_k}^{\alpha_k} \in \overline{r}$ the set $\overline{x}$ contains all items (q, d, i, j) such that

$$\text{take}_{2(d+1)}\ (\alpha, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \ldots, \alpha_k, \beta_k, \beta) = \rho.$$

Here $\text{take}_n\ s$ denotes the sequence resulting from taking the first n elements of the sequence s. Secondly, for each rule $q = N_\beta^\alpha \to X_1{}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_h{}_{\beta_h}^{\alpha_h} \bot \in \overline{r}$ the set $\overline{x}$ contains all items (q, d, i, j) such that $d \leq h - 1$ and

$$\text{take}_{2(d+1)}\ (\alpha, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \alpha_2, \beta_2, \ldots, \alpha_h) = \rho.$$

Theorem 4.1. *Let x be a parameterized item. Then $\overline{x} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $x = (r, d, i, j, \rho)$, and $r = N_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k}$. We know that $\rho \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{d+1}\rangle$.

If there is $\rho' \in \Phi^{2(k-d)}$ such that $\xi = \rho\rho' \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{k+1}\rangle$ then $\overline{x}$ is not empty as $(N_{\xi_{2k+1}}^{\xi_0} \to X_{\xi_2}^{\xi_1} \ldots X_{\xi_{2k}}^{\xi_{2k-1}}, d, i, j) \in \overline{x}$. Otherwise there must be h with $d + 1 \leq h < k$ and $\rho' \in \Phi^{2(h-d-1)}$ such that $\xi = \rho\rho' \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_h\rangle$, together with some $\gamma \in \Phi$ such that f_{h+1} is undefined at $\xi\,\gamma$. This means that for any $\beta \in \Phi$, we have $(N_\beta^{\xi_0} \to X_{\xi_2}^{\xi_1} \ldots X_\gamma^{\xi_{2h-1}} \bot, d, i, j) \in \overline{x}$. □

Given an item set I, we define its induced item set $\overline{I}$ as

$$\overline{I} = \bigcup_{w \in I} \overline{w}$$

The idea of PELLA is that it operates on item sets I just as ELLA would operate on $\overline{I}$. For each of the original building blocks Init', $\text{Predict}'$, $\text{Complete}'$, Tokens' and Scan' of ELLA we define the corresponding building blocks Init, Predict, Complete, Tokens and Scan of PELLA as shown in Figure 1 (the use of the $\bullet$ notation for PELLA items is analogous to its use for ELLA items). Apart from this adaptation of the building blocks to a parameterized setting, PELLA is defined via exactly the same equations as ELLA is, as shown in Figure 2.

Theorem 4.2 (Correctness of PELLA)**.**

$$\sigma(D) = \{\rho_{2u+1} \mid (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_u^{f_u} \bullet, 0, |D|, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I} \wedge \rho_0 = \phi_{start}\}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{Init} = \\
&\{(\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to \bullet X_1^{f_1} \dots X_u^{f_u}, 0, 0, \phi_{\textit{start}}\ f_1(\phi_{\textit{start}})) \mid \\
&\quad (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_u^{f_u}) \in \mathfrak{R} \\
&\wedge\ f_1 \text{ is defined at } \phi_{\textit{start}}\} \\
\\
&\text{Predict}\ k\ I = I \cup \\
&\{(M_{g_{u+1}} \to \bullet\, Y_1^{g_1} \dots Y_u^{g_u}, k, k, \rho_{2d+1}\ g_1(\rho_{2d+1})) \mid \\
&\quad (M_{g_{u+1}} \to Y_1^{g_1} \dots Y_u^{g_u}) \in \mathfrak{R} \\
&\wedge\ g_1 \text{ is defined at } \rho_{2d+1} \\
&\wedge\, (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I \\
&\wedge\, X_{d+1} = M\} \\
\\
&\text{Complete}\ k\ I = I \cup \\
&\{(N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \bullet \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho'\ f_{d+2}(\rho')) \mid \\
&\quad (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, j, \rho) \in I \\
&\wedge\, (M_{g_{u+1}} \to Y_1^{g_1} \dots Y_u^{g_u} \bullet, j, k, \xi) \in I \\
&\wedge\, X_{d+1} = M \wedge \rho_{2d+1} = \xi_0 \wedge \rho' = \rho\, \xi_{2u+1} \\
&\wedge\ f_{d+2} \text{ is defined at } \rho'\} \\
\\
&\text{Tokens}\ T\ k\ I = \textit{Sel}\ T \\
&\{x \mid (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I \\
&\wedge\, X_{d+1} \in \mathfrak{T} \wedge x \in \textit{Lex}(X_{d+1}, \rho_{2d+1}, D, k)\} \\
\\
&\text{Scan}\ T\ k\ I = I \cup \\
&\{(N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \bullet \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k + |c|, \rho'\ f_{d+2}(\rho')) \mid \\
&\quad (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I \\
&\wedge\ (X_{d+1}, \rho_{2d+1}, \beta, c) \in T \wedge \rho' = \rho\, \beta \\
&\wedge\ f_{d+2} \text{ is defined at } \rho'\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 1. Building Blocks of PELLA

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{limit}\ f\ X &= \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(X) \\
\pi_k\ T\ I &= \text{limit}\ (\text{Scan}\, T\ k \circ \text{Complete}\, k \circ \text{Predict}\, k)\ I \\
\mathcal{J}_0^0 &= \pi_0\ \emptyset\ \text{Init} \\
\mathcal{J}_k^{u+1} &= \pi_k\ \mathcal{T}_k^{u+1}\ \mathcal{J}_k^u \\
\mathcal{I}_k &= \bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_k^u \\
\mathcal{J}_{k+1}^0 &= \pi_{k+1}\ \emptyset\ \mathcal{I}_k \\
\mathcal{T}_k^0 &= \emptyset \\
\mathcal{T}_k^{u+1} &= \text{Tokens}\ \mathcal{T}_k^u\ k\ \mathcal{J}_k^u \\
\mathfrak{I} &= \mathcal{I}_{|D|}
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 2. PELLA equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{Init} &\sim \text{Predict}'\ 0\ \text{Init}' \\
I \sim I' &\Rightarrow \text{Predict}\, k\, I \sim \text{Predict}'\, k\, I' \\
I \sim I' &\Rightarrow \text{Complete}\, k\, I \sim \text{Complete}'\, k\, I' \\
I \sim I' &\Rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\text{Tokens}\, T\, k\, I) = \text{Tokens}'\ \mathcal{U}(T)\, k\, I' \\
I \sim I' &\Rightarrow \text{Scan}\, T\, k\, I \sim \text{Scan}'\ \mathcal{U}(T)\, k\, I'
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 3. PELLA simulates ELLA

Indeed, we can prove the correctness of PELLA by exploiting the fact that PELLA simulates ELLA. The proof works by explaining in detail what we mean by this simulation. To this end, we need a notion of correspondence between PELLA item sets I and ELLA item sets I'. Intuitively, $\overline{I} = I'$ is an obvious candidate for such a relation, but this does not work: I' may contain items of the form $(\top \to w_1 \bullet w_2, i, j)$ or $(N \to w \bullet \bot, i, j)$, both of which will never be in $\overline{I}$. Therefore, we define the correspondence $I \sim I'$ instead as $\overline{I} = \text{Norm}\,(I')$ where $\text{Norm}\,(I') = \{(N \to w_1 \bullet w_2, i, j) \in I' \mid N \neq \top \wedge w_2 \neq \bot\}$. Indeed, with this choice of correspondence the formulas in Figure 3 hold and show that the building blocks of PELLA simulate the building blocks of ELLA. In the following we will prove the formulas in Figure 3.

Theorem 4.3.

$$\text{Init} \sim \text{Predict}'\ 0\ \text{Init}'$$

Proof. From the definitions it follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{Norm}\left(\text{Predict}'\ 0\ \text{Init}'\right) = \\
&\quad \left\{(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{\textit{start}}} \to \bullet w, 0, 0) \mid (\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{\textit{start}}} \to w) \in \overline{\mathfrak{R}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

We first show $\mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,0\;\mathrm{Init}'\right) \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Init}}$. So assume that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to \bullet w, 0, 0) \in \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,0\;\mathrm{Init}'\right)$. There must be $r \in \mathfrak{R}$ such that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to w) \in \overline{r}$, and $r = \mathfrak{S}_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k}$ for some $f_1, \ldots, f_{k+1}$ and some $X_1, \ldots, X_k$.

If w does not end with $\bot$, we know there must be $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k$ such that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to w) = (\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to X_1 {}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_k {}_{\beta_k}^{\alpha_k})$, and we also know then that f_1 is defined on ϕ_{start}, and that either $k = 0 \wedge \beta = f_1(\phi_{start})$ or $k > 0 \wedge \alpha_1 = f_1(\phi_{start})$. For the parameterized item $x = (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{k+1}} \to \bullet X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k}, 0, 0, \phi_{start}\, f_1(\phi_{start}))$ this implies that $x \in \mathrm{Init}$, and that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to \bullet w, 0, 0) \in \overline{x} \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Init}}$.

If on the other hand w ends with $\bot$, then $k > 0$ and there must be $h \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_h$ and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_h$ such that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to w) = (\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to X_1 {}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_h {}_{\beta_h}^{\alpha_h} \bot)$. We also know then that f_1 is defined on ϕ_{start}, and that $\alpha_1 = f_1(\phi_{start})$. For the parameterized item $x = (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{k+1}} \to \bullet X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k}, 0, 0, \phi_{start}\, f_1(\phi_{start}))$ this implies that $x \in \mathrm{Init}$, and that $(\mathfrak{S}_\beta^{\phi_{start}} \to \bullet w, 0, 0) \in \overline{x} \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Init}}$.

We now prove $\overline{\mathrm{Init}} \subseteq \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,0\;\mathrm{Init}'\right)$. So assume $x' \in \overline{\mathrm{Init}}$. Then there must be $x \in \mathrm{Init}$ such that $x' \in \overline{x}$. We know that

$$x = (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to \bullet X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_u^{f_u}, 0, 0, \phi_{start}\, f_1(\phi_{start}))$$

for some $X_1, \ldots, X_u$ and some $f_1, \ldots, f_u$. From this $x' \in \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,0\;\mathrm{Init}'\right)$ immediately follows. □

Theorem 4.4. *Let x be a parameterized item such that*

$$x = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \ldots X_v^{f_v}, i, j, \rho)$$

(and $v \geq d+1$). Then for each $\gamma \in \Phi$ there is $x' \in \overline{x}$ with

$$x' = (N_\beta^{\rho_0} \to X_{\rho_2}^{\rho_1} \ldots X_{\rho_{2d}}^{\rho_{2d-1}} \bullet X_\gamma^{\rho_{2d+1}} w, i, j)$$

for some $\beta \in \Phi$ and some $w \in (\overline{\mathfrak{N}} \cup \overline{\mathfrak{T}})^*$.

Proof. The proof is basically the same as the proof of Theorem 4.1, only that instead of extending ρ we extend $\rho\,\gamma$ this time. □

Theorem 4.5. *Assume $(N_\beta^\alpha \to w) \in \overline{\mathfrak{R}}$. If w ends with $\bot$ then this implies $|w| \geq 2$. Furthermore, for any d with*

$$0 \leq d \leq \begin{cases} |w| & \text{if } w \text{ does not end with } \bot \\ |w| - 2 & \text{if } w \text{ ends with } \bot \end{cases}$$

and for any $0 \leq i \leq j \leq |D|$ there is a parameterized item

$$x = (N_{f_{k+1}} \to X^{f_1} \ldots X^{f_k}, d, i, j, \rho)$$

such that $(N_\beta^\alpha \to w, d, i, j) \in \overline{x}$.

Proof. Assume w does not end with $\bot$. Then there is a parameterized rule $r = N_{f_{|w|+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_{|w|}^{f_{|w|}} \in \mathfrak{R}$ such that $(N_\beta^\alpha \to w) \in \overline{r}$, and there are $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_{|w|}, \beta_{|w|}$ such that $w = X_1 {}_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_{|w|} {}_{\beta_{|w|}}^{\alpha_{|w|}}$ and $\alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_{|w|}\,\beta_{|w|}\,\beta \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{|w|+1} \rangle$. Setting $x = (r, d, i, j, \rho)$ where $\rho = \mathrm{take}_{2(d+1)}\,(\alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_{|w|}\,\beta_{|w|}\,\beta)$ yields the desired result.

On the other hand, assume w ends with $\bot$. Then there is a parameterized rule $r = N_{f_{k+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_k^{f_k} \in \mathfrak{R}$ such that $(N_\beta^\alpha \to w) \in \overline{r}$ and $1 \leq |w| - 1 \leq k$. In particular there are $\alpha_1, \beta_1, \ldots, \alpha_{|w|-1}, \beta_{|w|-1}$ such that $w = X_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \ldots X_{\beta_{|w|-1}}^{\alpha_{|w|-1}} \bot$ and $\alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_{|w|-1} \in \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{|w|-1} \rangle$. Setting $x = (r, d, i, j, \rho)$ where $\rho = \mathrm{take}_{2(d+1)}\,(\alpha\,\alpha_1\,\beta_1 \ldots \alpha_{|w|-1})$ yields the desired result in this case as well. □

Theorem 4.6. *Assume $I \sim I'$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Predict}\,k\,I \sim \mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'$$

Proof. We first prove $\overline{\mathrm{Predict}\,k\,I} \subseteq \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'\right)$, so assume $x' \in \overline{\mathrm{Predict}\,k\,I}$. Then there must be $x \in \mathrm{Predict}\,k\,I$ such that $x' \in \overline{x}$. If $x \in I$ then because of $I \sim I'$ it automatically follows that $x' \in \mathrm{Norm}\,(I') \subseteq \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'\right)$. So assume $x \notin I$. This means that

$$x = (M_{g_{u+1}} \to \bullet Y_1^{g_1} \ldots Y_u^{g_u}, k, k, \rho_{2d+1}\, g_1(\rho_{2d+1}))$$

and there is a parameterized item y where

$$y = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \ldots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I$$

such that $X_{d+1} = M$. From $x' \in \overline{x}$ it follows that

$$x' = (M_\gamma^{\rho_{2d+1}} \to \bullet a, k, k)$$

for some $\gamma \in \Phi$ and some $a \in (\overline{\mathfrak{N}} \cup \overline{\mathfrak{T}})^*$. From Theorem 4.4 we obtain an item y' with

$$y' = (N_\beta^{\rho_0} \to X_{\rho_1}^{\rho_0} \ldots X_{\rho_{2d}}^{\rho_{2d-1}} \bullet M_\gamma^{\rho_{2d+1}}\, w, i, k)$$

for some $\beta \in \Phi$ and some $w \in (\overline{\mathfrak{N}} \cup \overline{\mathfrak{T}})^*$. Because $I \sim I'$ implies $y' \in I'$ it follows immediately that $x' \in \mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'$. As x' is an induced item, this implies $x' \in \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'\right)$.

Now we prove $\mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'\right) \subseteq \overline{\mathrm{Predict}\,k\,I}$. Assume $x' \in \mathrm{Norm}\left(\mathrm{Predict}'\,k\,I'\right)$. If $x' \in I'$ then $x' \in \overline{I}$ and we are done, so assume $x' \notin I'$. This means that $x' = (M_\gamma^\alpha \to \bullet a, k, k)$ for some $M_\gamma^\alpha \to a \in \overline{\mathfrak{R}}$, and there is $y' = (N_\delta^\beta \to b \bullet M_\gamma^\alpha, i, k) \in I'$. This means that there is $y \in I$ with $y' \in \overline{y}$. From Theorem 4.5 we obtain an x with $x' \in \overline{x}$ and it follows straight from the definitions that $x \in \mathrm{Predict}\,k\,\{y\}$. □

Theorem 4.7. *Assume $I \sim I'$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Complete}\,k\,I \sim \mathrm{Complete}'\,k\,I'$$

Proof. We first prove $\overline{\text{Complete}\,k\,I} \subseteq \text{Norm}\,(\text{Complete}'\,k\,I')$, so assume $x' \in \overline{\text{Complete}\,k\,I}$. Then there must be $x \in \text{Complete}\,k\,I$ such that $x' \in \overline{x}$. We can assume $x \notin I$ as otherwise the result follows immediately. This means that there are parameterized items y and z such that x, y and z have the shape

$$x = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \bullet \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho'\, f_{d+2}(\rho'))$$
$$y = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, j, \rho) \in I$$
$$z = (M_{g_{u+1}} \to Y_1^{g_1} \dots Y_u^{g_u} \bullet, j, k, \xi) \in I$$

such that $X_{d+1} = M$ and $\rho_{2d+1} = \xi_0$ and $\rho' = \rho\,\xi_{2u+1}$. Moving the dot in x' one position to the left results in an item y', and obviously $y' \in \overline{y}$. From Theorem 4.1 we obtain $z' \in \overline{z}$. Because of $I \sim I'$ we have $\{y', z'\} \subseteq \text{Norm}\,(I')$. Furthermore it is easy to see that $x' \in \text{Complete}'\,k\,\{y', z'\}$. This concludes this direction of the proof.

For the other direction assume $x' \in \text{Norm}\,(\text{Complete}'\,k\,I')$. We need to show that $x' \in \overline{\text{Complete}\,k\,I}$. We can assume $x' \notin I'$ as otherwise $x' \in \overline{I}$ follows immediately. Then there exist $y', z' \in I'$ such that x', y' and z' have the shape

$$x' = (N_\beta^\alpha \to X_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots X_{\beta_d}^{\alpha_d} X_{\beta_{d+1}}^{\alpha_{d+1}} \bullet a, i, k)$$
$$y' = (N_\beta^\alpha \to X_{\beta_1}^{\alpha_1} \dots X_{\beta_d}^{\alpha_d} \bullet X_{\beta_{d+1}}^{\alpha_{d+1}}\, a, i, j)$$
$$z' = (X_{\beta_{d+1}}^{\alpha_{d+1}} \to b \bullet, j, k)$$

where $a \neq \bot$ as $x' \in \text{Norm}\,(\dots)$. Because of $I \sim I'$ there exist $y, z \in I$ with $y' \in \overline{y}$, $z' \in \overline{z}$ and

$$y = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, j, \rho)$$
$$z = (M_{g_{u+1}} \to Y_1^{g_1} \dots Y_u^{g_u} \bullet, j, k, \xi)$$

Because of $a \neq \bot$ we know that f_{d+2} is defined on $\rho' = \rho\,\beta_{d+1}$ and thus $x \in \text{Complete}\,k\,\{y, z\}$ where

$$x = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \bullet \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho'\, f_{d+2}(\rho'))$$

It is clear that $x' \in \overline{x}$, which concludes the proof. □

Theorem 4.8. *Assume $I \sim I'$. Then*

$$\mathcal{U}(\text{Tokens}\,T\,k\,I) = \text{Tokens}'\,\mathcal{U}(T)\,k\,I'$$

Proof. Let us first introduce two abbreviations V and V':

$$V = \{x \mid (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I$$
$$\wedge\, X_{d+1} \in \mathfrak{T} \wedge x \in \mathit{Lex}(X_{d+1}, \rho_{2d+1}, D, k)\}$$
$$V' = \{x \mid\ X \in \overline{\mathfrak{T}} \wedge (Y \to a \bullet X b, i, k) \in I'$$
$$\wedge\, x \in \overline{\mathit{Lex}}(X)(D, k)\}$$

Unfolding the definitions of Tokens and Tokens′ shows that the theorem statement is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathit{Sel}(T, V)) = \overline{\mathit{Sel}}(\mathcal{U}(T), V')$$

which according to the definition of $\overline{\mathit{Sel}}$ is equivalent to

$$\overline{\mathit{Sel}}(\mathcal{U}(T), \mathcal{U}(V)) = \overline{\mathit{Sel}}(\mathcal{U}(T), V').$$

This means that if we can prove

$$\mathcal{U}(V) = V'$$

we have proven the theorem.

We first prove $\mathcal{U}(V) \subseteq V'$, so assume $(t_\beta^\alpha, c) \in \mathcal{U}(V)$, or equivalently $(t, \alpha, \beta, c) \in V$. This means that there is a parameterized item

$$x = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_d^{f_d} \bullet X_{d+1}^{f_{d+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho) \in I$$

with $X_{d+1} = t$, $\rho_{2d+1} = \alpha$ and $(t, \alpha, \beta, c) \in \mathit{Lex}(t, \alpha, D, k)$. Theorem 4.4 yields an item $x' \in \overline{x} \subseteq \overline{I} \subseteq I'$ such that

$$x' = (N_\delta^{\rho_0} \to X_{\rho_2}^{\rho_1} \dots X_{\rho_{2d}}^{\rho_{2d-1}} \bullet t_\beta^\alpha\, w, i, k)$$

for some δ and some w. This proves $(t_\beta^\alpha, c) \in V'$.

To prove $V' \subseteq \mathcal{U}(V)$, assume $(t_\beta^\alpha, c) \in V'$. Then there must be an item

$$x' = (Y \to a \bullet t_\beta^\alpha\, b, i, k) \in I'$$

such that $(t_\beta^\alpha, c) \in \overline{\mathit{Lex}}(t_\beta^\alpha)(D, k)$, or equivalently

$$(t, \alpha, \beta, c) \in \mathit{Lex}(t, \alpha, D, k)$$

Because the dot in x' appears before a terminal symbol we know that $x' \in \text{Norm}\,(I')$, thus there is an $x \in I$ with

$$x = (N_{f_{v+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_{|a|}^{f_{|a|}} \bullet X_{|a|+1}^{f_{|a|+1}} \dots X_v^{f_v}, i, k, \rho)$$

such that $x' \in \overline{x}$. This implies $X_{|a|+1} = t$ and $\rho_{2|a|+1} = \alpha$. This proves $(t, \alpha, \beta, c) \in V$. □

Theorem 4.9. *Assume $I \sim I'$. Then*

$$\text{Scan}\,T\,k\,I \sim \text{Scan}'\,\mathcal{U}(T)\,k\,I'$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward and similar to the proof of Theorem 4.7. □

Apart from using parameterized building blocks, PELLA as shown in Figure 2 is identical to ELLA as shown in Figure 4. Given that we now know that all of PELLA's building blocks simulate those of ELLA as described in Figure 3, it is easy to see that the relationship $\mathfrak{I} \sim \mathfrak{I}'$ holds for the result $\mathfrak{I}$ of PELLA and the result $\mathfrak{I}'$ of ELLA. We show this in the following through a sequence of simple theorems.

Theorem 4.10. *Assume $I_u \sim I'_u$ for all $u \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Then*

$$\left(\bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} I_u\right) \sim \left(\bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} I'_u\right)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\pi'_k\, T\, I &= \text{limit}\ (\text{Scan}'\, T\, k \circ \text{Complete}'\, k \circ \text{Predict}'\, k)\, I \\
\mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,0} &= \pi'_0\, \emptyset\ \text{Init}' \\
\mathcal{J}'^{\,u+1}_{\,k} &= \pi'_k\, \mathcal{T}'^{\,u+1}_{\,k}\ \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \\
\mathcal{I}'_k &= \bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \\
\mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,k+1} &= \pi'_{k+1}\, \emptyset\, \mathcal{I}'_k \\
\mathcal{T}'^{\,0}_{\,k} &= \emptyset \\
\mathcal{T}'^{\,u+1}_{\,k} &= \text{Tokens}'\ \mathcal{T}'^{\,u}_{\,k}\ k\ \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \\
\mathfrak{I}' &= \mathcal{I}'_{|D|}
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 4. ELLA equations

Proof.

$$
\overline{\bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} I_u} = \bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} \overline{I_u} = \bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} \text{Norm}\,(I'_u) = \text{Norm}\left(\bigcup_{u=0}^{\infty} I'_u\right)
$$

□

We say that a function f simulates a function g iff $I \sim I'$ implies $f\, I \sim g\, I'$ for any I and I'.

Theorem 4.11. *If f simulates f' and g simulates g' then $g \circ f$ simulates $g' \circ f'$.*

Proof. From $I \sim I'$ follows $f\, I \sim f'\, I'$, and from that $g\,(f\, I) \sim g'\,(f'\, I')$ follows. □

Theorem 4.12. *Assume that f simulates g. Then for any $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ we have that f^n simulates g^n.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.11. □

Theorem 4.13. *Assume that f simulates g. Then* limit f *simulates* limit g.

Proof. We need to show that from $I \sim I'$ it follows that

$$
\left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} f^n(I)\right) \sim \left(\bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} g^n(I')\right)
$$

which follows immediately from Theorems 4.10 and 4.12. □

Theorem 4.14. *$\pi_k\, T$ simulates $\pi'_k\, \mathcal{U}(T)$.*

Proof. We know that Predict k simulates Predict$'$ k (Theorem 4.6), Complete k simulates Complete$'$ k (Theorem 4.7) and Scan $T\, k$ simulates Scan$'$ $\mathcal{U}(T)\, k$ (Theorem 4.9). From this and Theorems 4.11 and 4.13 the result follows immediately. □

Theorem 4.15. $\mathcal{J}^0_0 \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,0}$

Proof. We have $\pi'_0\, \emptyset\ \text{Init}' = \pi'_0\, \emptyset\, (\text{Predict}'\, 0\ \text{Init}')$, which together with Theorems 4.3 and 4.14 implies $\mathcal{J}^0_0 \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,0}$. □

Theorem 4.16. *Assume $\mathcal{J}^0_k \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,k}$. Then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}^u_k &\sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \quad \textit{for all } u \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \\
\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}^{\,u}_k) &= \mathcal{T}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \quad \textit{for all } u \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \\
\mathcal{I}_k &\sim \mathcal{I}'_k
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We first prove $\mathcal{J}^u_k \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k}$ and $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}^{\,u}_k) = \mathcal{T}'^{\,u}_{\,k}$ by induction over u. The base case $u = 0$ follows trivially from our assumption $\mathcal{J}^0_k \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,0}_{\,k}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{U}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$. For the induction step $u \to u + 1$ we apply Theorem 4.8 and the induction hypothesis and obtain $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}^{\,u+1}_k) = \mathcal{T}'^{\,u+1}_{\,k}$. From this, together with Theorem 4.14 and the induction hypothesis, we obtain $\mathcal{J}^{u+1}_k \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,u+1}_{\,k}$.

From $\mathcal{J}^u_k \sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k}$ for all $u \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ and Theorem 4.10 follows then immediately $\mathcal{I}_k \sim \mathcal{I}'_k$. □

Theorem 4.17.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}^u_k &\sim \mathcal{J}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \quad \textit{for all } k, u \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \\
\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{T}^{\,u}_k) &= \mathcal{T}'^{\,u}_{\,k} \quad \textit{for all } k, u \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\} \\
\mathcal{I}_k &\sim \mathcal{I}'_k \quad \textit{for all } k \\
\mathfrak{I} &\sim \mathfrak{I}'
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. The first three formulas follow immediately by induction over k and application of Theorem 4.15 and Theorem 4.16 for the base case, and Theorem 4.14 and Theorem 4.16 for the induction step, respectively.

We then deduce $\mathfrak{I} = \mathcal{I}_{|D|} \sim \mathcal{I}'_{|D|} = \mathfrak{I}'$. □

We are now in a position to prove the correctness of PELLA.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We first introduce the abbreviation

$$
\begin{aligned}
P = \{\rho_{2u+1} \mid (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_u^{f_u} \bullet, 0, |D|, \rho) \in \mathfrak{I} \\
\wedge\ \rho_0 = \phi_{\textit{start}}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then our goal is to prove $\sigma(D) = P$.

To prove $\sigma(D) \subseteq P$, assume $\beta \in \sigma(D)$. Then there is a path $p \in \ell\ell(D)$ such that $\top \Rightarrow \mathfrak{S}^{\phi_{\textit{start}}}_{\beta} \overset{*}{\Rightarrow} [p]$. This means that there is an item $x' = (\mathfrak{S}^{\phi_{\textit{start}}}_{\beta} \to w, 0, |D|)$ which is p-valid, i.e. $x' \in \langle\mathfrak{P}\rangle$. From the correctness proof of ELLA we know that $\langle\mathfrak{P}\rangle = \mathfrak{I}'$ and thus $x' \in \mathfrak{I}'$, and the shape of x' implies even $x' \in \text{Norm}\,(\mathfrak{I}')$. Therefore Theorem 4.17 allows us to deduce $x' \in \overline{\mathfrak{I}}$, and this means that there is an $x \in \mathfrak{I}$ such that $x' \in \overline{x}$ and such that x has the shape

$$
x = (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \ldots X_u^{f_u} \bullet, 0, |D|, \rho)
$$

From $x' \in \overline{x}$ follows immediately that $\rho_0 = \phi_{start}$ and $\rho_{2u+1} = \beta$, and therefore $\beta \in P$.

To prove the other direction, $P \subseteq \sigma(D)$, assume we have an $x \in \mathfrak{I}$ such that $x = (\mathfrak{S}_{f_{u+1}} \to X_1^{f_1} \dots X_u^{f_u} \bullet, 0, |D|, \rho)$ and $\rho_0 = \phi_{start}$. We need to prove $\rho_{2u+1} \in \sigma(D)$. Theorem 4.1 tells us that there is an $x' \in \overline{x}$, and this x' has necessarily the form

$$x' = (\mathfrak{S}^{\phi_{start}}_{\rho_{2u+1}} \to w \bullet, 0, |D|)$$

From Theorem 4.17 and the correctness of ELLA follows $x' \in \overline{x} \subseteq \overline{\mathfrak{I}} \subseteq \mathfrak{I}' = \langle \mathfrak{P} \rangle$. Thus there is a path $p \in \mathfrak{P}$ such that x' is p-valid, i.e. there is $v \in \{0, \dots, |p|\}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\overline{p}| &= |D| \\ |\overline{p_0 \dots p_{v-1}}| &= 0 \\ \top &\overset{*}{\Rightarrow} [p_0 \dots p_{v-1}] \mathfrak{S}^{\phi_{start}}_{\rho_{2u+1}} \gamma \quad \text{for some } \gamma \\ w &\overset{*}{\Rightarrow} [p_v \dots p_{|p|-1}] \end{aligned}$$

As part of the correctness proof of ELLA we have previously seen that if we drop the first v empty tokens of p, the result $q = p_v \dots p_{|p|-1}$ will still be in $\mathfrak{P}$ (Theorem 5.2 in [1]). We deduce

$$\top \Rightarrow \mathfrak{S}^{\phi_{start}}_{\rho_{2u+1}} \Rightarrow w \overset{*}{\Rightarrow} [q]$$

and $q \in \ell\ell(D)$, and thus $\rho_{2u+1} \in \sigma(D)$. □

References

[1] Steven Obua, Phil Scott, Jacques Fleuriot. *Local Lexing*, arXiv: 1702.03277, February 2017.